

MINUTES/ACTIONS

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION Also Meeting As STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Ladislaus B. Dombrowski Board Room
John A. Hannah Building
608 West Allegan
Lansing, Michigan

February 17, 2000
9:00 a.m.

Present: Mr. Arthur E. Ellis, Chairman
Mrs. Dorothy Beardmore, President
Mrs. Kathleen N. Straus, Vice President
Dr. Herbert S. Moyer, Secretary
Mrs. Sharon A. Wise, Treasurer
Mrs. Sharon L. Gire, NASBE Delegate
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire
Mr. Michael David Warren, Jr.
Mrs. Eileen L. Weiser
Mr. Scott Jenkins, representing Governor John Engler, ex officio

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Ellis called the meeting to order at 9:25 a.m.

II. PERSONAL PRIVILEGE - MR. ARTHUR ELLIS

Mr. Ellis said Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, was instrumental in the planning and design of the renovation of the Board Room. He said she has worked diligently to ensure that everything was ready and operational for today's meeting, but he pointed out that it was also the first live test of the sound equipment so the Board members should keep that in mind.

Mrs. Hamilton said a sound technician will be making adjustments throughout the day in an effort to fine tune the system, and Michigan Government Television (MGTV) is now receiving a direct feed through the audio system. She said eventually the MGTV cameras will be on wall mounts, and therefore, the cables on the floor and tripods will be eliminated.

Mrs. Hamilton said a platform will be built soon so the new television monitor will be elevated and easier for people in the back of the room to see, but the height had not been determined prior to the Board meeting.

Mrs. Straus said the Board Room is certainly more attractive and inviting than it used to be.

Mrs. Beardmore said many of the complaints regarding the Board Room voiced throughout the years have been addressed such as the lighting and sound systems. She said though the renovation was a joint effort by staff in different state departments, Mrs. Hamilton was the lead person for making sure it all happened in a timely manner.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

- A. Approval of Standards for the Preparation of English Teachers - added to agenda
- B. Approval of Standards for the Preparation of Mathematics Teachers - added to agenda
- C. Response to Board Inquiry Regarding State Requirements for Teacher Certification Testing Program - added to agenda
- D. Progress Report on Accountability/Accreditation - added to agenda
- E. Approval of Nomination to the Michigan School for the Deaf Citizens Advisory Committee - added to agenda
- F. Report of the Superintendent - Report on Department of Education Cosponsorships - added to agenda
- G. Report of the Superintendent - 1999-2000 Continuation Grants to Provide Technical Assistance for Low Achievement Schools - added to agenda
- H. Approval of the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Status Report on the University of Michigan-Flint Teacher Preparation Program - removed from consent agenda and placed under discussion items

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the agenda and order of priority, as modified.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

IV. AGENDA MATERIALS

- A. Revised Report on the Consent Agenda - Memorandum dated February 17, 2000, from Arthur E. Ellis to the State Board of Education
- B. Information Relating to the Review of Department of Education Budget Bill for FY 2000-2001
- C. Response to Board Inquiry Regarding State Requirements for Teacher Certification Testing Program
- D. Progress Report on Accountability/Accreditation

V. INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS PROVIDED TO THE BOARD

- A. Memorandum dated February 17, 2000, from Arthur E. Ellis to the State Board of Education regarding Information on the Michigan 1999 Youth Risk Behavior Survey
- B. Memorandum dated February 17, 2000, from Alexander G. Davlantes, Administrative Officer to the State Board of Education regarding Update on Activities at Michigan Schools for the Deaf and Blind and Camp T
- C. Memorandum dated February 17, 2000, from Arthur E. Ellis to the State Board of Education regarding Information on the Michigan Community Colleges Enrollment Profile, Fall 1999
- D. Memorandum dated February 17, 2000, from Arthur E. Ellis to the State Board of Education regarding Information on Nominations to the Special Education Advisory Committee

VI. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS AND GUESTS

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, introduced the members of the Board and guests attending the meeting.

VII. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES AND RECEIPT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS/MINUTES

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mrs. Beardmore, that the State Board of Education approve the minutes/actions of January 13, 2000.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

VIII. APPROVAL OF SELECTION CRITERIA FOR SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Mr. Ellis introduced Ms. Edith Harsh, Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Education, who will provide legal guidance and respond to questions from the Board regarding the search for a Superintendent of Public Instruction. He said he recommended in a meeting yesterday with Mrs. Beardmore and Mrs. Straus, that the Board convene as a Committee of the Whole to allow for open discussion regarding the superintendent search. He said this format would prohibit any motions or voting, but he feels that it would provide an opportunity for the Board to move the process along at a quicker pace.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer, that the State Board of Education move into a Committee of the Whole to discuss the selection criteria for the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

IX. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING

The Board met as a Committee of the Whole beginning at 9:35 a.m. The Board discussed the job description and criteria prepared by Mrs. Beardmore, Mrs. Straus, and Mrs. Weiser, and additional information submitted by Mr. Warren and Mrs. McGuire. During the discussion, several modifications were suggested. There was consensus that the Board could not complete this task at this session.

The Committee of the Whole meeting ended at 12:15 p.m.

X. RECESS

The Board recessed for lunch at 12:15 p.m. and reconvened at 1:15 p.m.

XI. APPROVAL OF SELECTION CRITERIA FOR SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (continued)

At Mrs. Beardmore's request, Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education, provided a working draft of the revised criteria for the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Mrs. Hamilton explained that the job description, criteria, and related document have been combined into one document. She said changes as a result of the Committee of the Whole discussion are in bold print. The working draft is attached as Exhibit A.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mrs. Straus, that the State Board of Education (1) poll Department staff regarding their suggestions for desired qualities in the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and (2) direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to seek bids from search firms outlining their proposals which are to include cost and services provided, to be done expeditiously for report to the Board at the March 16, 2000, meeting.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

XII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A. Ms. Mary T. Wood, 27533 Santa Ana, Warren, Michigan 48093. Ms. Wood offered comments regarding Conner Creek Academy, Central Michigan University, the State Board of Education oversight responsibilities of public school academies, and Department of Education processes for addressing complaints made against charter schools.

XIII. REVIEW OF STATE SCHOOL AID ACT FOR FY 2000-2001

Ms. Elaine Madigan Mills, Director, Office of State Aid and School Finance, provided information and a slide presentation, and responded to questions from the Board regarding the State School Aid Act.

Ms. Mills distributed copies of the State School Aid Fund by Source of Revenue 1981-82 to 1997-98; 1998-99 School Aid Fund Revenues; Executive Budget Recommendations State School Aid Act Highlights; Foundation Allowance History: and a hard copy of the slide presentation.

Ms. Mills said the two largest revenue driven funds in Michigan are the General Fund and the State School Aid Fund. She said the Legislature has a constitutional responsibility to determine the distribution of these funds, but, there is a stipulation that the State School Aid Fund must be used only for public education.

Ms. Mills said revenue projections by the Executive Office and the House and Senate Fiscal Agencies have indicated that there will be approximately \$750 million remaining in the State School Aid Fund at the end of fiscal year 1999-2000, and \$1 billion at the end of the fiscal year 2001 provided that no changes are made in the laws regarding public education. She said there is, understandably, a lot of interest in how those funds will be spent. She said it is important to remember that the Legislature must appropriate and the Governor approve spending from the State

School Aid Fund, and so the monies will remain where they are until such action takes place.

Ms. Mills said even though the Executive Budget has been proposed, and the bill is not yet available, the Senate K-12 Subcommittee has already requested some changes. She said the entire process is projected to not be finalized until June 2000.

Ms. Mills said a majority of the revenue received for the 1998-99 School Aid Fund was from sales and use taxes which equaled 47% or \$4,729 million while other sources included income tax, state education tax, tobacco and liquor, and lottery revenues. She said by reviewing the spread sheet, it is evident when Proposal A took effect because of the increase in sales tax and the introduction of the state education tax and real estate transfer tax which are earmarked for education.

Ms. Mills said the School Aid Budget for 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 have already been enacted into law, but the Governor is proposing some changes and has begun establishing the budgets for 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Ms. Mills said because the bill is not available, staff cannot determine if there is a tie-bar between the School Aid Act and other legislation which may effect the number of charter schools allowed by law.

Mr. Jenkins said he thinks the Governor has been very clear on the fact that the issue is full reform for full funding.

Ms. Mills said the School Aid Act is unique in that it is a living document, does not expire at the end of the year, and is part of the State Compiled Laws. She said the Executive Budget recommendations for the State School Aid Fund include that it (1) amends fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001; (2) adds appropriations for fiscal year 2002 and fiscal year 2003; (3) provides foundation allowance increases of 3.5% each year for 2001 through 2003; (4) expands and enhances current initiatives; (5) recommends new initiatives; and (6) describes resolution to the Durant II Court Case.

Ms. Mills said the current law contains an increase of \$170 in the foundation allowance for fiscal year 2001, but the Governor is recommending an increase of 3.5% or \$200, with another 3.5% or \$207 in 2002.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Ms. Mills said the minimum foundation amount has been less than the state basic foundation figure and the foundation allowances formula causes that number to increase at a faster rate than the districts at the top. She said there is a Hold Harmless level which is always \$1,500 more than the basic, and that a district above that would have to levy an extra local millage to raise the money. She

said next year, if nothing has changed, all districts will at least receive the basic and move ahead at the same dollar amount per pupil.

In response to Mr. Warren, Ms. Mills said using the current formula, districts at the bottom will never catch up because the dollar amount increase is the same.

Ms. Mills said even if the foundation allowance is raised by 3.5% for the next three years, there will still be districts below the \$6,500 level. She said in an effort to offset this, the Governor is proposing an equity payment of up to \$183 which will guarantee \$6,500 to all districts by 2003. She said if this equity payment is considered a part of the foundation allowance, it will be a reduction in the \$1,500 gap.

Ms. Mills said the Governor's 3.5% a year increase is based on projections that the State School Aid Fund revenues will increase by 3% per year, and that the end of 2003, there will be a \$500 million balance in the State School Aid fund. She said the Senate assumes a 4% per year increase in revenues, and proposes more of a front end loading of the money by increasing the foundation by 5% for two years, and 3% the third year.

Ms. Mills said additional enhancements and initiatives proposed by the Governor for fiscal year 2000 include: (1) \$10 million for the Family Independence Agency Summer Family Enrichment Project. She said this is a one year program that provides extra assistance to families in need of help. (2) \$8 million for the Golden Apple Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) Incentives which are designed to reward the entire staff of a school which does well on the MEAP tests. (3) \$10 million for the Educational Performance and Information Center (EPIC). She said this system will build on the Single Student Record Database and put it into a comprehensive and usable format which will be accessible by the public.

Mrs. Beardmore said because special education funds are channeled through the State School Aid Act and are, therefore, restricted, it is imperative to ensure alignment of state and federal policies. She said most recommended practices point out that the State School Aid Act, as it is enacted, is too tightly structured to allow professional decisions to be made which would meet the service needs of special education students, and permit the flexibility of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 97.

Ms. Mills said she thinks there is a concern that by making the use of those monies more flexible, it could increase the state's expenditures in State School Aid fund for special education. She said there would have to be an analysis of the potential financial impact to the state on loosening up on how federal funds could be used.

In response to Mrs. Beardmore, Ms. Mills said staff in the Department of Management and Budget will work on the fiscal year budget proposals for the 2002

and 2003 State School Aid Acts sometime this year, so it does provide some opportunity to suggest possible changes.

Ms. Mills said the Governor proposes the continuation of the Golden Apple Award for fiscal year 2001, and the EPIC project which will be reduced to \$2 million. She said this is not because of the loss of importance, but simply because the first year funding of \$10 million is for start up costs, and the \$2 million thereafter, is for maintaining the program.

Ms. Mills said expansion of enhancements and initiatives for fiscal year 2001 would include: (1) An additional \$20 million to provide full funding for At-Risk pupils. (2) An additional \$23.5 million to provide school readiness services for another 4,000 children. (3) An additional \$15 million for Full-Day Wrap-Around for School Readiness. (4) Schools-of-Choice Beyond Contiguous Districts. She said the current program allows schools of choice within intermediate school district boundaries and with other contiguous districts, but this initiative would expand the program statewide. She said she assumes that random selection will remain in effect so school districts cannot be particular in which students attend their schools.

In response to Dr. Moyer, Ms. Mills said she believes school districts still have the option to participate in the schools of choice program, but it is not mandatory. She said they may also limit the number of students they will accept.

Ms. Mills said new items for fiscal year 2001 include: (1) \$55 million a year for two years has been slated for the Teacher Technology Initiative which includes laptops and training for teachers. (2) \$38 million for optional summer school for 2nd, 3rd, and 4th graders which would be geared toward students who are at risk or have not done well on the MEAP. (3) \$15 million for the Michigan Virtual High School which she believes will be linked to the Michigan Virtual University. (4) Revamping of Adult Education into the Partnership for Adult Learning. She said there is currently \$80 million in that program, but the Governor is proposing an increase to \$100 million and change the focus of the program. She said the Partnership for Adult Learning will operate through the Department of Career Development, and funding will be more competitive. She said the Senate Subcommittee is suggesting that the existing program and funding remain in place, while the additional \$20 million be used for the Partnership for Adult Learning.

Mrs. Straus said the proposed Partnership for Adult Learning plan would pose some difficulties for school districts in that they are encouraged to develop strategic plans, but not guaranteed to receive money for their adult learning programs.

Mrs. Beardmore said adult basic education or literacy, and high school completion are both components of adult education programs. She said adult basic education is essential when considering the needs of infants and toddlers who will not develop early unless their parents become literate, and so there is a role for adult education that is not associated directly with job skills.

In response to Mrs. Beardmore, Ms. Mills said she believes that the Legislature recognizes the need to retain the adult basic education, English as a second language, and high school completion components of that bill. She said she anticipates the expansion of workforce readiness, but types of services provided will differ from region to region as determined by the local workforce development boards.

Mrs. Straus said the Board's constitutionally charged responsibility for the general supervision of adult education should be kept in mind when recommendations are made for changes.

Ms. Mills said the proposal for fiscal year 2002 urges the continuation of programs such as (1) Golden Apple MEAP Incentives; (2) EPIC; (3) Teacher Technology Initiative; (4) Optional Summer Schools for 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Graders; and (5) Michigan Virtual High School which would drop from \$15 million to \$1.5 million as simply a matter of maintaining the program after the initial start up costs.

Ms. Mills said the Governor's proposal for fiscal year 2003 would encourage the same level of funding for (1) Golden Apple MEAP Incentives; (2) EPIC; and (3) the Michigan Virtual High School. She said the Teacher Technology Initiative was originally slated as a two-year program, and therefore would not be continued in 2003. She said the Full-Day Wrap-Around for School Readiness would be increased by another \$5 million, the Summer School - Optional 2nd and 3rd graders and Required for 4th graders with low MEAP achievement would be up to \$50 million, and the Governor is recommending that the Class Size Reduction Pilot Project be extended to 2003.

Ms. Mills said a Court Decision was reached regarding the Durant II Resolution in October, 1999 which indicates that the State of Michigan is meeting its Headlee obligation for special education and that the formulas in Section 51a are adequate for reimbursement for special education and transportation costs. She said the Court also stated that the State School Aid Act was not clear that the foundation grant and unrestricted funds were being provided for all students, so the state was not meeting its Proposal A obligation.

Ms. Mills said the Governor has proposed changes to the State School Aid Act to provide a clear demonstration that the state is meeting both of those obligations under the constitution and that no additional dollars are required. She said under this proposal, the state will pay a foundation allowance for all pupils, but it will be at the fiscal year 1995 foundation allowance level. She said the Constitution requires that districts not receive less per pupil than they did in fiscal year 1995, so this would meet the minimum requirement of Proposal A. She said the next step would be to meet the special education Headlee obligation. She said the state would reimburse districts at 28.6138% of their special education costs, and 70.4165% of their special education transportation costs.

Ms. Mills said a comparison of those two amounts to calculations under the current formula would reveal a surplus of funds which would be distributed in the form of a

discretionary payment to school districts. She said this would meet the Proposal A and special education Headlee obligations, and pay out any other money that would have been generated by the current year formulas. She said this results in three payments equal to what the districts would have gotten under the current formulas of state aid, and is slated to begin in 2001.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Ms. Mills said the window for filing an appeal of the Court Decision regarding Durant II has closed.

Mr. Warren thanked Ms. Mills for her presentation, and said the Constitution is clear in the Board's responsibility to advise the Legislature regarding the financial requirements of public education. He said this is a good opportunity for the Board to start going back to its Constitutional responsibilities in earnest, and he thinks the Governor's Executive Budget Recommendations are good in that they address the foundation grant, the Durant II decision, At-Risk programs, class size reductions, Full-Day Wrap Around, Partnerships for Adult Learning, Teacher Tech Initiative, Summer Family Enrichment, and the Golden Apple MEAP Initiative.

Mr. Warren moved, seconded by Mrs. Wise, that the State Board of Education endorse and recommend to the Legislature the Governor's proposed State School Aid Act for Fiscal Year 2000-2001 through Fiscal Year 2002-2003.

Mrs. McGuire offered an amendment that the State Board of Education not endorse the removal of the cap on the number of public school academies.

No support was offered for the amendment.

Mr. Warren said if the Board is going to meet its Constitutional responsibilities, then it should engage in policy discussion regarding financial requirements and the recommendations it wishes to make to the Legislature and Governor's office.

Mrs. Beardmore said she thinks the Board has accomplished that somewhat in the last several months by focusing attention to the early intervention, building on, for example, the READY program, and not limiting pre-school to four year old children at risk of academic failure.

Mrs. Beardmore said she feels that it is more appropriate for the Board to expect staff to proceed in following recommendations made by the Board, rather than simply endorsing proposals which may or may not come to fruition.

Mr. Warren said he may be willing to entertain an amendment to his motion based on particular policy initiatives that the Board approves or disapproves. He said the Michigan State Constitution states that the Board, "...shall serve as the general planning, coordinating body for all public education, including higher education, and shall advise the Legislature as to the financial requirements in connection therewith."

Article VIII, Section 3 (in part). He said he does not feel that making periodic recommendations on a couple of different policy issues meets that responsibility, nor should the Board rest on its laurels by saying that it has established a policy here and there.

Mrs. Beardmore said she would argue that the Board can make recommendations to the Legislature for funding for public education and on issues it has identified as important. She said she does not think it is the role of the Board to rework the State Aid Fund, nor is its purpose accomplished by stamping approval on proposals that have already been made.

Mrs. Gire said in support of that statement, she thinks the Board should avoid either supporting or opposing the Governor's positions. She said there are some components of the State School Aid Act issues that she would advocate, but she feels that the Board is better off taking initiatives on issues it has already spent time on rather than putting itself in an awkward position with the Governor's office. She said right now some of those would be strictly opinion and not necessarily based on any kind of in-depth research, and therefore, she would not be comfortable in doing that.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board has made several recommendations with financial implications such as starting services at birth when the need exists, as well as the expansion of full day full service schools. She said the Board may not have the expertise to say that each of these activities is right on target.

Mrs. Weiser asked Mr. Jenkins where the concepts and budget information are generated since clearly some of these are new programs. In response, Mr. Jenkins said they may come from different departments, or can be recommendations and/or modeled from other states. He said in many cases the policy analysis, research, and drafting comes from the Department of Management and Budget, but new ideas such as the Laptops for Teachers were the brainchild of the Governor. He said the Golden Apple Award has been done in a couple of other states, but Michigan's proposal takes it further in providing a financial award to every full-time staff member of a winning school.

Mrs. Weiser said this is clearly an opportunity in Michigan. She asked that if initiatives come to the Board, are developed from a budget perspective, and staff analysis is provided, should Board recommendations be presented to the Governor through Mr. Jenkins. In response, Mr. Jenkins said the Superintendent of Public Instruction would serve in that function. He said if the Board wishes to implement an initiative they must become involved in the process of establishing the program such as how it is structured, the selection of the criteria, and how the recipients of the award are chosen. He said a good example of that would be the Golden Apple Award. He said a vast majority of the schools which received this award have a large student population on free and reduced lunches, and therefore, they are doing exactly what we want them to do which is to ensure that each student is learning and achieving well.

Mrs. Gire said the Board is very concerned with closing the gap between low and high achieving schools, and providing assistance to districts which are floundering. She expressed concern that the Golden Apple Award program only benefits the top achieving schools.

Ms. Mills said the issue of providing technical assistance to schools which are not doing well is a small categorical of \$1.5 million in the School Aid budget. In response to Mrs. Gire, Ms. Mills said that amount has not been increased over the 1999 budget.

Mrs. Straus said Mrs. Gire has raised a valid point. She said even though the Board stated that it wanted to do something about this issue last year, neither the Department of Management and Budget, the Governor's office, nor the Legislature were informed. She said there are many parts of this proposal that she is not comfortable with, and she does not feel that the Board is prepared to vote on a blanket endorsement of the proposed State Aid bill. She said it would have to be gone through in an item by item manner to determine the Board's position.

Mr. Warren said he strenuously objects to Mrs. Beardmore's comment that the State Board of Education does not have the expertise to deal with these issues. He said the Board currently consists of a former superintendent and members with many years of experience in the education field. He said the State Constitution is clear in the Board's responsibilities. He said he would be willing to revisit the State Aid bill in another two or three months if the Board wants to prioritize financial discussion and endorse three or four pieces of the bill. He said Ms. Brenda Welburn, Executive Director, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), stated that the Board should be engaged in the policy debate, and it was the intention of his motion to encourage discussion. He said he hopes that even if it fails, the Board will continue to consider this issue under a different motion and a different kind of discussion.

Mrs. McGuire said she thinks that Mr. Warren's concept is good in that the Board takes some initiative in dealing with the whole budget question, but she is not prepared to agree with it as presented.

Mrs. Beardmore said there are issues which the Board has extensive expertise and is actively involved in supporting such as early intervention. She said many of the policy issues have fiscal ramifications, and if the Board wants to take a position that effects the State Aid bill or the Department's budget, she personally thinks that is the way to go. She said she does not know if the Golden Apple is a good program, but she is aware that some states have pulled away from it because of the possibility of fraud, so it must be carefully watched in how people access it. She said the Board is expert on many issues, but it is not going to be able to develop the documentation

needed, for example special education which has federally mandated restrictions. She said staff have the skills necessary to provide that information to the Board.

In response to Mrs. Weiser, Mrs. Beardmore said the Board has made recommendations regarding the reading program and school readiness recently which has had an impact on funding. She said she feels that the Board is a part of the system because of the discussions held at its meetings.

Mr. Ellis said by the time it was decided to move the State School Aid Act to a multi-year budget, it was too late for the Board to become involved in the current year. He said the 2003-2004 fiscal year budget is now under consideration, and it is imperative to direct a certain forum framework for how to intercept this process.

Dr. Moyer said even though the Board's advocacy for school construction and renovation is not part of the current State Aid bill, he hopes that it is still pending someplace. He expressed concern that the budget for accreditation has remained unchanged for many years, and yet schools have been identified that require assistance through PA 25 of 1990 legislation. He said this has been a successful program implemented by skilled staff, and he feels it needs to be expanded. He asked how the Board may effect some changes that will impact the local schools.

Mr. Ellis said the Department of Education is the only agency impacted by multi-year budgets, and so no process has been established.

Mrs. Straus said the State Aid Bill is one area that the Board is able to impact change and make specific recommendations.

Dr. Michael Williamson, Deputy Superintendent for Education Services, assured Dr. Moyer that issues endorsed by the Board have been presented to the Department of Management and Budget and the Governor's office. He also reassured the Board that its wishes regarding Section 94 of the State School Aid Act that provides technical assistance to districts for accreditation have been carried out in the process.

Mrs. Gire said if the Board wants to develop credibility with the Legislature, it is important to not only make a timely approach, but also have backup materials for any initiatives the Board feels are important. She said she is aware that both Mrs. Beardmore and Mrs. Straus have recently met with the committee chairs, and agrees that it is an effective way to engage the Legislature, but she feels that both processes should be actively pursued to accomplish that goal.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Warren, Weiser, Wise

Nays: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus

The motion failed.

Mrs. Beardmore said there seems to be consensus on the importance of technical assistance to school districts which are in the deepest trouble.

Mrs. Gire said Dr. Lindy Buch, Supervisor, School Development Unit, provided information to the Board at the May 20, 1999, meeting regarding accreditation, and it was determined that the Board needed further data before a recommendation could be established. She asked if staff could pull together information for the Board regarding what could be done within the next two years to implement expansion of this program. She said it is imperative that the Board be able to back up recommendations with facts as opposed to simply stating that they endorse a particular program.

Mr. Warren said there seems to be a consensus that the Board would like to move forward with some sort of budget recommendation. He said he suggested endorsing the Governor's proposals, (1) because he substantively believes in them, and (2) because he had the opportunity to review the material and think about the issues. He said he does not believe that the Board has had that opportunity, and therefore, he suggests that either the Board direct the Superintendent to have staff review the prior policy initiatives of the Board, compare them to the State budget, and report to the Board if substantive differences are discovered, or form a subcommittee of the Board to evaluate potential state funded recommendations. He said if the Board is going to build credibility, it must have documentation to backup its initiatives.

Mrs. Beardmore said the State Board of Education has adopted an accountability/accreditation plan.

Mrs. Gire moved, seconded by Dr. Moyer, that the State Board of Education direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to have staff develop a budget proposal for a reasonable expansion of services needed for technical assistance to move more schools toward closing the gap.

Mr. Jenkins suggested that staff also provide information on how the Department currently expends funds, and if the resources are distributed statewide or if individual buildings are targeted.

Dr. Williamson said Section 94 funds are utilized for three technical assistance providers each within a geographic area of the state. He said the lowest performing schools are targeted for ongoing monitoring, and a staff person is assigned to each building as a point of contact and to offer guidance toward higher levels of performance. He said additional funds are used for low performing but less critical schools. He said the Board was presented with information regarding technical assistance about a year and a half ago, but he feels that it is necessary to move toward

a case management model.

Dr. Williamson said more resources must be made available for technical assistance to schools. He said the main weakness with the current program is not in the amount of financial resources, but the lack of staff. He said in the context of a richer environment to provide technical assistance, it is necessary to develop some new models which may require additional funding. He said the issue is more complex, however, than simply increasing a specific line item. He said The Achievement Group provided information to the Board at its October 23, 1997, meeting and gave the impression that Michigan was doing quite well with its accreditation program. He said data indicates that school staff who attend training sessions experience a day away from work and may or may not learn anything new.

Dr. Moyer said Dr. Williamson is presenting a different picture than that of The Achievement Group, and his comments indicate that the accreditation program is a failure and should be re-evaluated. Dr. Moyer said The Achievement Group expounded on some issues that had resonating facts to them and he was impressed. Dr. Williamson said the presentation was very positive, but then other issues surfaced once the data were revealed.

Dr. Moyer said that may be true, but he feels the program has shown success and yet the funding is not increased so that even more schools may benefit.

Mrs. Beardmore said that was one of the intentions for the Field Services Unit, and the importance of onsite technical assistance is well known.

Mrs. Gire said her motion is intended to request staff to identify actions needed to move schools forward, for example, additional training models. She said the state simply cannot take over all school districts that are not doing well, and therefore, it is necessary to develop collaborative processes for school improvement.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Moyer, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise

The motion carried.

XIV. REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUDGET BILL FOR FY 2000-2001

Mr. Rick Floria, Director, Budget Office, provided information and a slide presentation, and responded to questions from the Board regarding the Department of Education budget bill for fiscal year 2000-2001.

Mr. Floria said the proposed budget for the Department of Education for 2000-2001 is \$925,310,500, which is approximately 1/10 the size of the State School Aid Act

budget. He said the Department's budget is 94.1% supported by federal funds, 3.6% state funds, and 2.3% restricted funds. He said \$61,529,100 has been designated for staff salaries and Department expenses and equals about 7% of the Department's total budget while the grant section of the Department budget bill represents 93% of the total budget at \$863,781,400.

Mr. Floria said the Department budget supports three very large federal grant programs: (1) Title I at 41.3% or \$346 million; (2) School Lunch at 29.1% or \$244.5 million; and (3) State School Aid Act at 28.6% or \$248.3 million.

Mr. Floria said the two state grants include: (1) School Readiness at 75% or \$12,100,000; and (2) School Breakfast Program at 25% or \$4,100,000.

Mr. Floria said the restricted funds consist of driver and motorcycle fees, Christa McAuliffe, and Safety Education grants. He said even though the Christa McAuliffe grant is a federally funded program, it is through a foundation and that is why it shows up as a restricted grant.

Mr. Floria said Ms. Mary Lannoye, State Budget Director, presented the 2000 Executive Budget to the Legislature on January 27, 2000. He said many deadlines must be met by the Department to satisfy the Executive Budget process which begins as early as August. He said the steps necessary to comply include: (1) Outline the Department's program goals and outcomes; (2) Provide baseline economic detail which is necessary so that the Department of Management and Budget may apply inflationary factors to salary and wages; (3) Identify current services baseline which would include technical changes such as those necessary as a result of Executive Order 1999-12; (4) Request proposals for change that would entail prioritizing relative to the Department's core mission. He said Department of Management and Budget (DMB) also encourages that staff provide offsetting deducts.

Mr. Floria said due dates for these budget development requests remain virtually the same each year, and therefore, the Board has an opportunity to review proposals. He said the best time to present them to the Superintendent, though, is at the end of the summer so that staff can build the Board's recommendations into the process. He said DMB and the Governor will consider all requests and review economic forecasts and revenue projections before making a decision. He said his experience is that budget proposals which are part of the Executive Budget stand a better chance of making it through the legislative process than those which are added after the Executive Budget has been established.

Mr. Ellis said the dilemma is that the Board must develop a method so that staff can go forth with a single message.

Mrs. Straus said the Board has been requesting this kind of participation in the

process for many years, and she does not recall that it has ever been given this type of schedule before. She said it is imperative that the Board plan to participate as much as possible.

Mrs. Beardmore said the Board discussed budget requests many years ago, but it has fallen by the wayside as the process has changed. She said if the Board wishes to be initiators and part of the process, it may be necessary to hold periodic discussion throughout the year and be ready to move by July or August.

Mr. Warren agreed with Mrs. Beardmore and reminded the Board that 94% of the Department's budget is federally funded, and is probably restricted. He said the Board may not be able to have an effect on certain elements without actively lobbying Congress. He said rather than being concerned with numbers, the Board should focus on policies and how they fit into the budget.

Mr. Warren asked whether the travel cap reduction in 1989-90 and 1991-92 were a reaction to the Board, or was it because of the budget crisis. In response, Mr. Floria said it was his understanding that in 1989-90 when the travel cap was first established, there was a foreign travel experience that resulted in an accusation of inappropriate use of federal funds and grand jury testimony. He said the per diem decrease in 1991-92 came about when the Governor wanted to have fewer Board meetings.

Mrs. Beardmore said Mr. Floria is correct in that there were questions raised and a grand jury investigation regarding the foreign travel excursion. She said in the end there was no finding of inappropriate use of federal funds, but the whole process caused agony and personal expense for many people. She informed the Board members that if they are indicted as a public official and then are exonerated, they can be reimbursed for legal expenses. She said if they are not indicted, but only investigated, they pay their own expenses. She said she feels that the slow decline of the number of per diems from 67.5 to 24 has been a result from that investigation.

Mrs. Weiser said as the Board becomes more aware of and active in the fiscal underpinnings of the Department's activities, it is important to remember that the entire state is being moved toward an outcome-based performance measured system. She said if the Board tries to give staff policy directions for developing new programs, it needs to pay attention to whether or not they can be assessed, based on a successful model, or is going to point staff in a direction that will result in recommendations that will never fly because they do not make sense to the budget people. She said she simply wants to ensure that the Board maximizes staff potential for success and not use time on issues that cannot be accomplished.

Mr. Floria said staff must also: (1) Provide federal fund program levels which basically summarize all federal programs operated through the Department over the last four years; (2) Prepare a reduction proposal, but the Department's participation

varies with the economy in this item; (3) Provide program descriptions prepared by each service area which includes an outline and organizational chart; and (4) describe in detail how the Department spends the money by line item for each budget requirement.

Mr. Floria said there is also an opportunity to provide: (1) Capital outlay requests for major building requirements or repairs for campuses in Lansing and Flint; and (2) Language section changes and legislation needed to implement the budget for additions or deletions.

Mr. Floria said the Executive Budget for the Department of Education for fiscal year 2000 totals \$1,001,506,100, but after adding \$10,611,600 in enhancements for fiscal year 2001 and subtracting \$86,807,200 in deductions, the Department's appropriations for fiscal year 2001 totals \$925,310,500. He said the enhancements include a new federal grant award for the Refugee Children School Impact Grant, while the reduction total reflects a decrease in the Michigan Education Information System and Study of Teacher Preparation.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Mr. Floria said the Migrant Technology program experienced problems from the start, so it was eventually decided that it was not feasible for Michigan. He said he thinks there were three other states involved with the program, but Michigan expended most of its funds received that first year, and then just decided not to continue.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Mr. Floria said staff could provide a report to the Board that would compare the budget with expenditures.

In response to Mrs. Straus, Mr. Floria said one of the proposals for change stated that the special education program administers \$800 million in state funds, but is only given \$144 million, so in order to continue facilitation, another full time staff person would be needed.

Mr. Ellis said the largest proposal for change is the School Readiness Program which is designed to assist the Department in dealing with the school improvement/school readiness program.

Dr. Michael Williamson, Deputy Superintendent for Education Services, said that program directly addresses one of the Board's priorities, and is used to fund the creation of an electronic template that will systematize PA 25 school improvement planning and reporting connected to the accreditation program so that the Department may provide more focused technical assistance.

Mr. Floria said five of the eleven proposals for change were supported. They are as follows: (1) Development and Evaluation of the School Components of the Reading Plan for Michigan; (2) Additional State Aid Position; (3) Technology in Support of

School Improvement; (4) Special Education Administration; and (5) Student Assistant Funding and Contracted Services.

Mr. Floria reiterated that the proposals for change supported in the Executive Budget will, more than likely, make it through the legislative process.

Mr. Ellis said the proposal for change for the Data Manipulation/Analysis, Local Assistance is the expansion of the Single Student Record Database. He said the Governor's office has been receiving requests for money from other agencies for similar work, and it was in that framework that the decision was made to recommend EPIC.

Mrs. Weiser asked whether the Clarification of Michigan Content Standards and Benchmarks was an effort to build on the Achieve Report, and if those funds are not granted, is the Department still able to proceed? In response, Dr. Williamson said staff is proceeding with some of the projects, but this funding would have provided for additional programs. He said four large projects are funded through Goals 2000 that will address each of the four core areas providing clarifying documents, and structural assistance and classroom assessment documents.

XV. PERSONAL PRIVILEGE - DR. HERBERT MOYER

Dr. Moyer said he recently attended an Air Force Program in San Antonio, Texas, and was quite impressed with the discipline and opportunity it afforded students. He said he feels that the Board should encourage school districts to let students know of the positive effect of the military.

Mr. Ellis said the Department has a very good rapport with the military recruiting apparatus and academies.

No action was taken on this item.

XVI. RECESS

The Board recessed at 4:00 p.m. and reconvened at 4:20 p.m.

XVII. APPROVAL OF INCREASE IN SALARY FOR THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Mrs. Beardmore said Governor John Engler recently raised the salary of all state department heads from \$108,000 to \$118,000. She said because the Superintendent of Public Instruction is hired by the State Board of Education, his/her raise must be implemented by the Board.

Mr. Warren expressed concern that Parliamentary Procedure was not being followed because the agenda and order of priority were approved earlier in the meeting, and

Mrs. Beardmore was introducing an item not published in the schedule.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education amend the agenda to include Approval of Increase in Salary for the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise
Absent: Moyer

The motion carried.

Mrs. Beardmore moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education increase the salary of the Superintendent of Public Instruction from \$108,000 to \$118,000 effective January 1, 2000.

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Straus, Warren, Weiser, Wise
Absent: Moyer

The motion carried.

In response to Mrs. McGuire, Mr. Ellis said Senator Leon Stille, Chair, Education Appropriations Subcommittee, has been approached regarding lifting the \$27,500 cap on Board expenses. He said the first response to that request has been from the fiscal agency regarding expenses by Board members. He said he feels that the result may be a per member cap.

Mrs. Beardmore said Senator Stille's response was that a per member cap only makes sense. She encouraged all Board members to turn in their expenses regardless if they expect to be reimbursed simply to ensure that an accurate record of what it takes to support eight people is on file.

XVIII. UPDATE ON EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION

Ms. Kate McAuliffe, Director, Office of Government Services and Customer Satisfaction, provided information on the following bills:

<u>Bill Number</u>	<u>Description</u>
SB 766	School Board Vacancies: Amends the Revised School Code to extend time limit to fill local school board vacancy.
HB 4695	Board Membership: Amends the Revised School Code to require a majority of parents on advisory boards.
HB 5233	Locker Searches: Amends the Revised School Code to allow school locker searches at any time.
HB 5291-5293	Immunization: Amends the State School Aid Act, Public Health Code, and the Revised School Code to require schools, beginning in 2002-2003, to assess each entering 6 th grade student's immunization status.

Ms. McAuliffe said there will be a joint House/Senate committee meeting scheduled next week regarding the Benton Harbor bill.

In response to Mrs. Gire, Ms. McAuliffe said there is a different governance tier identified in the Benton Harbor bill as compared to the Detroit Reform bill.

Mrs. Straus asked if objective criteria for school district take overs should be developed. In response, Mr. Ellis said that developed criteria allows for a state takeover based on three years of Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) test scores. He said the problem lies with the Legislature which consistently changes the tests so the required amount of data are uncollectible.

Mrs. Gire said the Benton Harbor bill is specific for a local school district. She said it would create less animosity if a systematic process were developed regarding school district take overs. She said the problem with Detroit was that even though the school district admittedly had problems, there are certainly other districts worse off.

Mr. Warren said in his 1997 State of the State address, the Governor suggested a statewide systematic process for intervention based on factors such as test scores and drop out rates. He said many of the educational organizations would not accept the idea because it would have included many school districts. He said the compromise was to target Detroit Public Schools because its problems were well documented.

Mr. Ellis said the public is usually quite vocal when asked about what the criteria should be for a school district takeover.

Mrs. Gire said maybe the criteria should entail a series of intervention steps similar to the Board's accreditation/accountability plan.

Mr. Ellis said discussion on the Benton Harbor bill was anticipated for quite some time, so when it finally occurred, there were no surprises or protests.

Mr. Ellis said Inkster Public Schools came under scrutiny during the Detroit takeover, and has been monitored for several months. He said Mr. Don Weatherspoon, Director, Office of School Safety, has attended every Inkster Public School Board of Education meeting for the last six months, and the Department has been open for discussion and available to offer advice when needed. He said the local board arrived at a decision, on its own accord, to hire the Edison Project to manage their school district. He said he contacted Ms. Edith Harsh, Assistant Attorney General in Charge of Education, to discuss how the Department may assist in providing technical expertise regarding meshing a private corporation with a school district.

Mrs. Gire said Mount Clemens Public Schools has a program run by the Edison Project, but they still control the budget and decisions regarding allocations. She said they have been through a very controversial process in renewing that contract because some members of their board believe mistakes were made the first time.

Mr. Ellis said the objective is to ensure a successful school district. He said the Edison Project will assume Inkster's current \$1.2 million deficit, and guarantee a computer in the home of every student. He said he feels that will convince many parents to keep their children in that school district.

Mrs. Beardmore said it is becoming apparent that there are a number of approaches to meeting the needs of school districts nearing disaster rather than simply taking them over.

Mrs. Straus said she thinks it also shows that the Board and the Department must assist districts before there is a problem, and make resources available when it becomes apparent that they are heading in that direction.

Mr. Ellis said many districts experiencing trouble have deep societal problems as well.

Mrs. Straus said it is imperative for the community to become involved in a school district to ensure student success. She said even with welfare reform, there are citizens who are unable to find jobs which affects schools in their respective communities.

Mr. Jenkins said it is a fascinating time to be involved in education, but wanted to point out that it took a crisis level at local districts before change was deemed necessary. He said in a lot of governmental endeavors, it is the people at the ground level who can not see how desperate their situation is. He said he thinks to a certain extent, it does not matter what the state does in terms of supportive measures because the people from classroom teachers to board members, do not recognize the position

they are in.

XIX. REPORT OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

Criteria

- F. Approval of Criteria for the 2000-2001 Michigan School Readiness Program Grants for Four-Year-Old Children At-Risk of School Failure
- G. Approval of Criteria for the 2000-2001 New and Continuation Even Start Grants
- H. Approval of Criteria for the 2000-2001 Federally-Funded Child Care and Development Fund Grants for Three-Year Old Children
- I. Approval of Criteria for the 2000-2001 Federally-Funded Child Care and Development Fund Grants for School-Age Child Care

Approvals

- J. Approval of Periodic Review/Program Evaluation Status Report on the University of Michigan-Flint Teacher Preparation Program - this item has been removed from the consent agenda and placed under discussion items

Reports

- K. Receive the Annual Report on Activities of the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers
- L. Approval of October - December 1999 Report of State Board of Education Travel Expenses
- U. Approval of Nomination to the Michigan School for the Deaf Citizens Advisory Committee

Mrs. Straus moved, seconded by Mr. Warren, that the State Board of Education approve the items listed on the consent agenda as follows:

- F. approve the criteria for the 2000-2001 Michigan School Readiness Program Grants for Four-Year-Old Children At-Risk of School Failure, as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated February 2, 2000;**

- G. approve the criteria for the 2000-2001 New and Continuation Even Start Grants, as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated February 2, 2000;**
- H. approve the criteria for the Federally-Funded 2000-2001 Child Care and Development Fund Competitive Grants for Three-Year-Old Children, as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated February 2, 2000;**
- I. approve the criteria for the 2000-2001 Federally-Funded Child Care and Development Fund Competitive Grant Program for School-Age Child Care, as described in Attachment A of the Superintendent's memorandum dated February 2, 2000;**
- J. (this item has been removed from the consent agenda and placed under discussion items);**
- K. receive the annual report on the activities of the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers for 1998-99, as described in the Superintendent's memorandum dated February 2, 2000;**
- L. (1) approve the October 1 - December 31, 1999, report of State Board of Education expenses, as attached to the Superintendent's memorandum dated February 11, 2000, and (2) authorize the Administrative Secretary to the State Board of Education to transmit the report to the House and Senate Fiscal Agencies and the Department of Management and Budget, as required by the Department of Education Appropriations Act; and**
- U. approve the appointment to the Michigan School for the Deaf Citizens Advisory Committee, as listed on Attachment A of the Superintendent's memorandum dated February 11, 2000.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

Ayes: Beardmore, Gire, McGuire, Straus, Warren, Weiser
Absent: Moyer, Wise

The motion carried.

XX. REPORT BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCHOOL SAFETY AND PREVENTION

Due to time constraints, this item was removed from the agenda.

XXI. APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF ENGLISH TEACHERS

Due to time constraints, this item was removed from the agenda.

XXII. APPROVAL OF STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF MATHEMATICS TEACHERS

Due to time constraints, this item was removed from the agenda.

XXIII. RESPONSE TO BOARD INQUIRY REGARDING STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHER CERTIFICATION TESTING PROGRAM

Due to time constraints, this item was removed from the agenda.

XXIV. APPROVAL OF THE PERIODIC REVIEW/PROGRAM EVALUATION STATUS REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-FLINT TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

Due to time constraints, this item was removed from the agenda.

XXV. PROGRESS REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY/ACCREDITATION

Due to time constraints, this item was removed from the agenda.

XXVI. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

Reports

- M. Report on Personnel Status
- N. Report on Administrative Rule Waivers
- O. Report on Property Transfers
- V. Report on Department of Education Cosponsorships

Grant Awards

- P. 1999-2000 Goals 2000 Cycle 9/Category One Grants
- Q. Eisenhower State Leadership Grant
- R. 1999-2000 Teacher of the Year Program
- W. 1999-2000 Continuation Grants to Provide Technical Assistance for Low Achievement Schools

Mr. Ellis provided an oral report on the following:

- A. Michigan Department of Education Reorganization

Mr. Ellis said the negotiations between the Departments of Career Development and Education are completed and details regarding the transfer of staff nearly finalized.

Mr. Ellis distributed a copy of the new organization chart for the Department of Education to the Board.

Mr. Ellis said the only major change on the new organization chart is that Ms. Kate McAuliffe has been given the title of Assistant Superintendent. He said that the organization chart no longer contains small, free standing units. He said the Department no longer has the resources and Civil Service will not approve the positions. He said all functions have been incorporated into the 14 offices below the Deputy and Assistant Superintendent levels.

XXVII. AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS

A. Update on Blue Ribbon Schools Program

Due to time constraints, this item was removed from the agenda.

XXVIII. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

A. National Association of State Boards of Education - Mr. Michael David Warren, Jr.

Mr. Warren said Ms. Brenda Welburn, Executive Director, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), addressed the Board at its November 18, 1999, meeting and recommended that it review each meeting regarding what has been accomplished to improve education in Michigan.

Mrs. Weiser said the Board spent much of the morning focusing on a job description and criteria to ensure that the new superintendent will be in sync with children in Michigan, and not just for Board member's individual or partisan or bureaucratic needs.

Mrs. Straus said Mrs. McGuire pointed out in her memorandum dated February 15, 2000, that one of the most important functions of the Board is to select a superintendent, and its whole purpose is to improve education in Michigan.

Mr. Jenkins agreed with Mrs. Weiser, and said that he thinks it is important to frame the kind of person the Board wants as the chief executive officer of the Department of Education.

Mrs. Gire said she thinks the Board also developed some knowledge base to

be a part of the process in terms of budget, and that is where priorities are set for students.

Mrs. McGuire said she has established the importance of having a superintendent with a strong educational background which she feels will benefit all children in Michigan.

Mr. Ellis read a request for applications for the superintendent of Los Angeles Public Schools which was prepared by a search firm. He said it is clear that the superintendent will be in charge of the school system while the board provides the guidance and gives him the authority to carry out his/her duties.

Mrs. Weiser said she thinks that the more prescriptive the Board gets, the less interested a potential candidate may be.

XXIX. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Board members were asked to submit agenda items for the March meeting to the Administrative Secretary. Mr. Ellis said Department staff, the Board President, and Vice President would be meeting within the next couple of weeks to develop and finalize the agenda.

XXX. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- A. March 16, 2000
- B. April 13, 2000
- C. May 18, 2000
- D. June 22, 2000

XXXI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Herbert S. Moyer
Secretary